

REMARKSSummary of the Office Action

Claims 1-30 are pending in the above-identified application.

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over Cherrick et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,528,304 ("Cherrick").

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections.

Applicants' Response to the
35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejection

Applicants' independent claims 1 and 13 are directed to a method and system for channel grazing from an electronic program guide (EPG). In the EPG, several selectable program listings and a PIP window are displayed. In a first mode, the program displayed in the PIP windows corresponds to a selected program listing. In a second mode, in response to selecting a program listing, information related to the selected program listing is displayed, while the program displayed in the PIP window is maintained (e.g., the program displayed in the PIP window does not correspond to the selected program listing).

Cherrick is directed to an on-screen program guide in which a user can highlight a program listing to cause the system to display the program of the listing in a PIP window (Column 6, lines 3-10). The Examiner contends that Cherrick shows all of the features of applicants' claimed invention. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection.

In particular, the Examiner contends that "Cherrick discloses a means of selecting whereby the selected channel is displayed in the picture-in-picture display concurrently with the display of the channel table, which reads on 'in response to selecting one of the displayed second program listings, displaying information on the selected second program while maintaining a picture-in-picture window with the display of the first program' (column 6, lines 53-59)" (Office Action, page 4).

By the Examiner's own contention, in what the Examiner identifies as Cherrick's second EPG mode, the selected channel is always displayed in the PIP display. In other words, the Examiner correctly concedes, by his own description of Cherrick, that "when the operator has selected a program listing . . . the tuner 21 will be switched to the channel highlighted . . . in order that the operator will be able to see the present programming in the P-I-P window" (Cherrick, Column 6, lines 4-10).

In direct contrast, applicants' claimed invention recites a second EPG mode in which the selected program listing and the program displayed in the PIP window do not correspond (i.e., another program is maintained in the PIP window). Thus Cherrick is completely different from applicants' claimed approach and therefore fails to show or suggests all of the features of applicants' claims 1 and 13.

For at least the foregoing reasons, independent claims 1 and 13 are allowable over Cherrick. Claims 2-12 and 14-24, which depend from independent claims 1 and 13, are also allowable over Cherrick for at least the reasons that independent claims 1 and 13 are allowable over Cherrick. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request

that the rejection of claims 1-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn.

Applicants' independent claim 25 is directed to a system comprising an electronic program guide and a last channel designation which identifies the channel being displayed prior to changing to the EPG mode. In the EPG mode, the last channel designation is displayed with other channel designations in the program listing. When the user selects the last channel designation, the tuner is set to the channel designated by the last channel designation.

The Examiner contends that Cherrick shows or suggests all of the features of applicants' claimed invention. In particular, the Examiner contends that figures 1 and 7 of Cherrick shows applicants' claimed feature of "display the last channel designation on the display screen with the program listings in the EPG mode; receive a user selection of . . . the last channel designation" (Office Action, page 11). However, these figures show an EPG with a picture-in-picture display. Applicants' claimed feature is directed to an EPG comprising a selectable designation of the last channel. The Cherrick reference simply does not show or suggest a program listing that comprises a last channel designation, much less a last channel designation that can be selected for tuning to the last channel.


For at least the foregoing reasons, independent claim 25 is allowable over Cherrick. Claims 26-30, which depend from independent claim 25, are also allowable over Cherrick for at least the reasons that independent claim 25 is allowable over Cherrick. Accordingly, applicants

respectfully request that the rejection of claims 25-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and prompt allowance of this application are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Chasan
Agent for Applicants
Registration No. 54,026
Ropes & Gray LLP
Customer No. 1473
1211 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036
Tel.: (212) 596-9000
Fax: (212) 596-9090